



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|
| 08/920,272 | 08/22/97 | MILLER | F 08338/024003 |

KRISTINA BIEKER-BRADY
CLARK & EBLING, LLP
176 FEDERAL STREET
BOSTON MA 02110

HM11/0525

EXAMINER

TENG, S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1646

DATE MAILED: 05/25/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.

08/920,272

Applicant(s)

Miller et al.

Examiner

Sally Teng

Group Art Unit

1646



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sally Teng (3) _____

(2) Kristina Bieker-Brady (4) _____

Date of Interview May 24, 1999

Type: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: Pending Claims

Identification of prior art discussed:

Calof and Mayo.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Attorney suggested amending the claims to include the limitation that the isolated precursor cells are multipotential precursor cells. Attorney pointed out that the prior art discloses precursor cells that are not multipotential. Examiner agreed to consider attorney's arguments when submitted in writing. Examiner will look over Mayo and Calof to see whether they disclose multipotential precursor cells.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.